

Interview Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,892	OBUKOWICZ ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Michael V. Meller	1654	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael V. Meller. (3) Tim McBride.
 (2) Ed Hejlek. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 October 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: All of record .

Identification of prior art discussed: All of record .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant will amend the claims to qualify the patient as suffering from a disease which needs to be treated by the COX-2 inhibiting plant extract .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of 2. NOTE: applicant's amendment adding in the language of "for a condition which is mediated by COX-2 expression" raises new issues since such an amendment changes the conditions of the claimed treatment. Further, the addition of the amendment "as determined in vitro by an IC 50 ratio of COX-1/COX-2" also raises new issues.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Applicants have argued that hyperprolactinemia is not mediated by COX-2 expression and such an argument in light of the amendments raises new issues. Applicants argue that since it is not expressly stated that the compound in JP '835 is expressly noted as being used to treat the COX-2 mediated component of cancer once again raises new issues since such a limitation was not previously presented before Final rejection.